



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,114	01/03/2005	Hugues Gabriel	0518-1083-1	9443
466	7590	08/20/2007	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			JAHANGIR, KABIR U	
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2ND FLOOR			2169	
ARLINGTON, VA 22202				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

NN

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/520,114	GABRIEL ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kabir Jahangir	2169	

.. The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address ..

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is responsive to the applicants' amendment filed on May 29, 2007. It is acknowledge that claims 1-10 were canceled and new claims 11-21 have been added. Examiner's objections to the claim 9 and rejection to the claims 1-2, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are hereby withdrawn, as necessitated by the amendments. Please note claims 11-21 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant has changed the scope of the claims by presenting new set of claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Faltings et al. (US Patent Applications 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings")

As per claim 11, Faltings teaches:

A method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system, comprising the steps of: creating rules (see travel segments and constraint are the rules, in paragraph [0033] and [0034]), each rule comprising a criteria section containing at least one criterion used for selection of a trip (see selection of trip in Fig. 3 item#46), and a content section containing data corresponding to a type of information applicable to a trip (see constraint refers to the data value of travel itinerary, in paragraph [0034]), the at least one criterion in each rule being a market pair (see origin and destination airport, in paragraph [0033]), the market pair comprising i) an origin market defining a geographic zone of departure of the trip and ii) a destination market defining a geographic zone of arrival of the trip (see geographical representation of origin and destination market, in Fig. 3 item#48); storing the created rules in a database on a computer readable medium (see travel information database stores all the travel segments and constraint, in paragraph [0027]); and accessing the stored rules in response to a reservation request (see identify itineraries by accessing a travel information database, in paragraph [0040]).

As per claim 12, as set forth in claim 11, comprising the further step of: defining the market pair with i) the origin market corresponding to at least one geographical zone type from the group consisting of an airport, a city, a state and country, a country, a geographical region, and a world (see origin airport which is a

geographical zone, in paragraph [0033]), and ii) the destination market corresponding to at least one geographical zone type from the group consisting of an airport, a city, a state and country, a country, a geographical region, and the world (see destination airport which is a geographical zone, in paragraph [0033]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 13-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") as applied to claim 12, in view Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler").

Faltings and Mogler are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer reservation system.

As per claim 13, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type.

Mogler disclose creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type (see priority rank associated with city code, in Fig. 4 item#312).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 14, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose created table includes at least i) the airport geographic zone type with a first priority rank, ii) the city geographic zone type with a second priority rank greater than the first priority rank, iii) the country geographic zone type with a third priority rank greater than the second priority rank, and iv) the geographic region geographic zone type with a fourth priority rank greater than the third priority rank.

Mogler disclose created table includes at least i) the airport geographic zone type with a first priority rank, ii) the city geographic zone type with a second priority rank greater than the first priority rank, iii) the country geographic zone type with a third priority rank greater than the second priority rank, and iv) the geographic region geographic zone type with a fourth priority rank greater than the third priority rank (see priority rank is different for different city, in Fig. 4 item#312).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine different priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 15, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose the origin market is a first geographical zone type and the destination market is a different, second geographical zone type.

Mogler disclose the origin market is a first geographical zone type and the destination market is a different, second geographical zone type ((see priority rank is different for different city, in Fig. 4 item#312).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine different priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 16, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose calculating a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a first priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the destination market, and iii) combining the first priority and the second priority.

Mogler disclose calculating a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a first priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the destination market, and iii) combining the first priority and the second priority (see priority values are calculated, in paragraph [0041]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine calculating priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 18, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria.

Mogler disclose additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria (see an additional criterion target share is assigned, in Fig. 4 item#310).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an additional criterion of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 19, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose the first criteria section for at least some of the rules, additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value

corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria.

Mogler disclose the first criteria section for at least some of the rules, additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria (see weight is assigned to the additional criterion, in Fig. 4 item#310).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine assigning weight to the additional criterion of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

Claims 17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") in view Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler") as applied to claims 13 and 19, and further in view of Winter et al. (US Patent Application 2001/0007088, hereafter "Winter").

Faltings, Mogler and Winter are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer reservation system.

As per claim 17, Faltings and Mogler disclose a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose at least one market of the market pair is defined by at least two geographical zone types from the group consisting of an airport, a city, a state and country, a country, a geographical region, and a world, and comprising the further step of: calculating a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the destination market, and iii) combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market.

Winter disclose at least one market of the market pair is defined by at least two geographical zone types from the group consisting of an airport, a city, a state and country, a country, a geographical region, and a world, and comprising the further step of: calculating a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the destination market,

and iii) combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market (see calculating the priority rank by combining the different cities priority value, in paragraph [0060]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority values of different cities of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to find lowest priority value (see paragraph [0062] of Winter).

As per claim 20, Faltings and Mogler disclose creating a reservation request by entering a origin market and a destination market as part of a trip search; searching the stored rules to find rules with market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination market entered for the reservation request; for the rules found to having market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination market, for each rule, computing the priority value of each market pair by i) assigning a priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the destination market. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search,

returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value.

Winter disclose combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search, returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value (see combining priority values of more the one cities, in paragraph [0060] and finding the lowest priority value, in paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority values of different cities of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

As per claim 21, Faltings and Mogler disclose a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with the lowest priority value.

Winter disclose returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with the lowest priority value (see principal minimization applies if two priority values are the same, in paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to principal minimization of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kabir Jahangir whose telephone number is 571-270-1761. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30am-5:00pm EST every other Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

K)

KJ

Patent Examiner

August 14, 2007


CHRISTIAN CHACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

note